

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
US APPLICATION NO. 09/888,449
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q64931

REMARKS

Introduction

Pending claims 1-3 have been examined and rejected. In particular, claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated over UK Patent Application No. GB 2326255A to Kaminsky et. al. (hereinafter "Kaminsky"). In addition, claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kaminsky, in view of US Patent No. 6,678,715 to Ando (hereinafter "Ando").

Applicants traverse the rejections of claims 1-3 as follows.

Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Kaminsky.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "[a] method of managing information in a distributed system ...includes defining in the local system classes replicating the hierarchy of classes in the remote system...." It is respectfully submitted that Kaminsky fails to disclose or suggest the unique combination of features recited in claim 1 and, thus, fails to anticipate claim 1.

For example, Kaminsky fails to disclose or suggest any replicating of a hierarchy of classes. Instead, Kaminsky describes that classes are distributed to one location or to another,

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
US APPLICATION NO. 09/888,449
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q64931

which does not correspond to locally replicating a full hierarchy of classes defined remotely in order to enable local use thereof.

Claim 3

Claim 3 recites, *inter alia*, that “the local system includes a ‘proxy’ for each interface and said proxy is defined to enable use in the local system of instructions specific to the interfaces defined in the remote system.” It is respectfully submitted that Kaminsky fails to disclose or suggest the unique combination of features recited in claim 3 and, thus, fails to anticipate claim 3.

For example, Kaminsky fails to disclose or suggest a local system that includes a “proxy” for each interface of a remote system. To the contrary, Kaminsky describes an interface X”Interface of proxy X”, which is a proxy for an object X of a distributed program (Kaminsky: Abstract; page 8, lines 34-36; and Fig. 1), which does not correspond a local proxy for a remote interface.

Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kaminsky, in view of Ando.

Claim 2 is dependent from claim 1. As discussed above, Kaminsky fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Since Ando fails to make up for the exemplary deficiencies of Kaminsky, as set forth above, claim 2 is patentable over the Examiner’s proposed

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
US APPLICATION NO. 09/888,449
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q64931

combination of Kaminsky and Ando at least by virtue of its dependency, as well as the additional features recited therein.

For example, claim 2 recites that “one of the instructions is a ‘horizontal casting’ instruction.” Since, as noted above, Kaminsky fails to disclose or suggest locally replicating a full hierarchy of classes defined remotely in order to enable local use thereof, Kaminsky does not teach and cannot possibly suggest the use of a “horizontal casting” instruction.

Claims

Applicants make minor cosmetic amendments to claims 1-3. It is respectfully submitted that these amendments are not intended to narrow the scope of the original claims, but are rather for precision of language and to explicitly recite within the claims what was believed to have already been implicitly defined therein. Accordingly, these amendments should not foreclose application of reasonable equivalents.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
US APPLICATION NO. 09/888,449
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q64931

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Billy Carter Raulerson
Registration No. 52,156

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 23, 2004